

10 April 1991

Secrecy, Democracy, and RAND

Norm Chomsky

1. How many people with clearances does
most of the of Norm Chomsky?
2. - What would be the effect on this thinking?
John lines?

NC assumes: I know all this; there would
be no news. Is this not quite wrong? (Post)
i.e., an error of NC!

3. What would be this critique of NC; this "oneness"?
- other than: "his implicit assumption that
we already 'know' all this, is wrong; he
is all off about our awareness, our state of
mind."

4. Is not NC's writing, "subject to a special clearance,
which they don't have?" classification

(and of whose existence they are not aware!
a "compartmentalised ~~clearance~~ ^{classification},"
a secret clearance/class.

5. How is this effect achieved?

(e.g.: by excluding NC entries from "unclassified"
publications those people do read: e.g. the NYT, Post,
TV evening news, Atlantic, New Yorker

6. Thus, the "national security community" is defined,
constituted, informed, of what they do not read -
"are not permitted to read" - as well as of what
they do read.

April 10, 91

2.

5. The RAND Dream: I'm back — but my feelings toward secrecy, and of past oaths, remain a problem; and I am about to confront my past colleagues, at least some of whom disapprove harshly...

7. What do I feel about people who do sign the secrecy oath — "after PP"?

8. ... or, who do observe the secrecy oath, and consider it binding, after they know what secrecy conceals?

9. Are they not traitors to democracy? Do they not betray the Court, and their oaths (if any) to uphold it? As they betray their oaths (if this occurs) to tell the truth to Congress, or a court?

Are they not part of a ("monstrous") conspiracy?

10. So — what do I think the secrecy system should be?

How should it operate, be constituted?

11. What should be subject to an obligation to tell, to reveal? (MHH)

12. Analogy: Wf I could not be accepted back into RAND, OOD, State, WH — not could I accept.

as if journalists were subject to the system! accepted it!

13. Note failure of journalists to challenge the system, the secrecy & lies; the failure to confront or challenge officials with the question: "Why do you ~~think~~ ^{or explain, reveal} "What right have/had you to lie, to conceal, what this? Who/what led you to think you had a right? How do you propose to pay, to compensate, make amends, for this concealment, these lies? Do you not feel guilt, shame? (You should...!)" What punishment, "degradation," civil damages, is appropriate? (e.g. banishment from public office!)

14. I did not reveal such matters; nor SI...;
 or "negotiations; footnotes";
 but if I had... what?

(note of attitude on Progression;
 vs. Nat. Hunt off of ad.)

15. Reveal/effort: extent of reveling agents
 among journalists (in the past, future:
 as, among my jurors;
 i.e. if have been "trusted,"
 misled about laws,
 regard oath & septa as legitimate
revelant
essential
 among Congressmen?

What is attitude of (Big) businessmen on (gov.) reveling?
 (to the businessmen: important!)

16. Note interest in gossip: in reveling private reveling,
 "construction of private reveling."
 New book on Nancy Reagan (introduction of
 private and public).
 17. CII story: can be presented as "alternative
 interpretations," hypotheses, "as consistent with
 known facts and notions as standard interpretations";
 18. Also, "what we don't really 'know'"; what should
 be regarded as "remaining mysteries" of CII.

+ Present

19. My Surprise Party: a benevolent conspiracy; if I
 had suspected it, it would have been "positive paranoia"
 wrong,
 a benign Fair Deal.
 (cf. Powell: "We've brought lots of tools to the party; we're going to
 use them all.")

massive
 torture session

considering
reveling is
 so effective,
 plausible,
 essential,
 generous,
 difficult.

20. Supreme Being: Wf are his real concerns? As benign in this case, and so pleasantly obedient?

As with Santa Claus, Easter bunny, tooth fairy?

Child's sense: benevolent universe

anything is possible

Hollywood: happy ending?

"Were you really surprised?"

Hard to believe; desire for reassurance?

Desire to believe it, desire for it

21. On Jan 17-18- on filing That "everyone" in Congress and public now supported the war:

as if they were all playing a different game from what you understood you were playing — they knew the rules, you thought you did but were evidently wrong ...

you were, apparently, heading for the wrong goal post ...

22. Seeing system: presents an adversarial contest, in which Pros/Exps is unequivocally the Captain/Coach, not an adversary (see, Catch-22...)